

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/641,031	0/641,031 08/16/2000		Arvind A. Raichur	30874-UT	30874-UT 3761	
5179	7590	11/02/2004		EXAM	INER	
		AND ADAMS P	SMITH, PETER J			
P O BOX 26 ALBUQUE		M 871256927		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
`	` '			2176		

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/641,031	RAICHUR ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Peter J Smith	2176				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	mely filed /s will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ju	une 2004.					
· <u> </u>	s action is non-final.					
	, -					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
·	diminor. Noto the diagnost office	77.00.017.017.17.17.07.02.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/641,031

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 6/14/2004.

- 2. The rejection of claims 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn in light of amended claim 17.
- 3. The rejection of claims 1, 7-8, 9, 15-16, 17, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorable site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 has been withdrawn.
- 4. The rejection of claims 2-6, 10-14, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorable site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 in view of Martinez et al., US 6,271,846 B1 filed 09/30/1998 has been withdrawn.
- 5. Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain, US 6,480,853 B1 filed 3/8/1999 in view of Chen, US 6,349,307 B1 filed 12/28/1998.

Regarding independent claims 1, 9, and 17, Jain teaches a search engine server which creates a custom search index to hypertext transmission protocol pages using a user's bookmarks

Art Unit: 2176

in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Bookmarks employ a hierarchical plurality of topic categories to organize the stored links. Jain does not teach permitting a user to specify any subset of the plurality of topic categories and adding to a hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user link information permitting execution of searches of the index server in any category of the subset but only of categories of the subset.

Chen does teach permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories and adding to a hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user link information permitting execution of searches of an index server in any category of the subset but of categories in the subset in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 10, 18, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can propose addition of a hypertext transmission protocol page to the bookmarks in conjunction with one or more categories of the subset and automatically adding the proposed page to the index server when the bookmarks URLs are uploaded to the index server.

Art Unit: 2176

The index is private for the user and thus other users will not search the proposed page, even if using the search engine server to search other topic categories.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 11, 19, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Jain does not teach verifying a that a uniform resource locator address for the proposed page is valid and that the proposed page is not already indexed under the proposed one or more categories. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jain in view of Chen so that it could have verified proposed pages and proposed categories so that the index would not have been redundant. This would have made the search engine more efficient.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 12, 20, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Jain does not teach that the custom created search index is sharable with other users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Jain in view of Chen to have allowed other users to have searched the proposed page when searching one or more of the proposed one or more categories to have allowed the search index users to have shared their proposed pages and increased the breadth of their searches by borrowing the URL index additions of other users.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 13, 21, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can rename one or more categories of a subset of bookmarks. Therefore, Jain

Art Unit: 2176

teaches allowing the user to rename one or more categories of the subset as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 14, 22, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. A user can rearrange one or more categories of a subset of bookmarks. Therefore, Jain teaches allowing a user to rearrange hierarchicalization of one or more categories of the subset as it will appear on the hypertext transmission protocol page controlled by the user.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 15, 23, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Chen teaches permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Regarding dependent claims 8, 16, 24, Jain teaches using personal bookmarks to create a custom search index in fig. 3 and 5, col. 2 line 55 – col. 3 line 12, col. 5 lines 58-64, and col. 6 lines 4-12. Chen teaches permitting a user to specify any subset of a plurality of topic categories in col. 9 line 47 – col. 10 line 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Jain to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to used the topic category selection search

Page 6

of Chen to have modified and improved Jain so that the user could have automatically filtered out topic categories for which they know no useful results would have been obtained. It would have been obvious and desirable to have dynamically updated the link information to correspond to the new subset. It would have allowed the user more control in the search process and enabled a better search result.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-11, filed 6/14/2004, with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 7-8, 9, 15-16, 17, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorable site mapping", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 and claims 2-6, 10-14, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maarek et al., "WebCutter: a system for dynamic and tailorable site mapping". Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 29, 1997 in view of Martinez et al., US 6,271,846 B1 filed 09/30/1998 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Li et al., US 6,631,496 B1 filed 3/22/1999 discloses personalizing, organizing, and managing web information. It provides a hypermedia database for managing bookmarks, which allows a user to organize hypertext documents for querying, navigating, sharing, and viewing.

Application/Control Number: 09/641,031

Art Unit: 2176

Adams et al., US 6,334,145 B1 filed 6/30/1998 discloses storing and classifying selectable web

page links and sublinks thereof to a predetermined depth. Horowitz et al., US 6,236,987 B1 filed

Page 7

4/3/1998 discloses dynamic content organization in information retrieval systems.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS

October 26, 2004